## **REMARKS**

In the Final office action mailed April 15, 2004, claims 1-33 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-30 of U.S. Patent No. 6,534,116 (Basol); claims 1 and 32 are objected to because of informalities; and claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph.

Applicants thank the Examiner in the examination of the application.

## Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

Applicants submit a Terminal Disclaimer to obviate the Obviousness-Type Double Patenting rejection. Accordingly, it is respectively requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

## 35 USC §112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Applicants amend claims 1 and 32 to correct the objected to informalities. Claim 3 is amended to correct the lack of antecedent basis for "applying the workpiece-surface-influencing device". Accordingly, it is respectively requested that the rejection to claims 3 and 4 and the objection to claims 1 and 32 be withdrawn.

## Conclusion

Applicants have addressed the concerns of the Examiner. A terminal disclaimer and fee are enclosed. Claims 1, 3, and 32 are amended. The claims are patentable over the art of record. For these reasons, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsiders and withdraws the rejections and objections to the claims and allows the application. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the claims be allowed.

If any matters can be resolved by telephone, applicants request that the Patent and Trademark Office call the applicants at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Daniel Hopen

Reg. No. 35,547

NuTool, Inc. Legal Department 1655 McCandless Drive Milpitas, CA 95035 (408) 586-9500, x268